

P O P E R Y,
Superstition, Ignorance,
AND
K N A V E R Y.

Confess'd, and fully Proved

ON THE

Surey Dissenters,

From the Second Letter of an APOSTATE
FRIEND, to ZACH. TAYLOR.

To which is added,

*A Refutation of Mr. T. Jollie's Vindication of the Devil
in Dugdale; or, The SUREY DEMONIACK.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. Kettlewhite at the White-Swan; and
J. Jones, at the Dolphin and Crown in St. Paul's-
Church-Yard, 1699.



The Surey Impostor.

FOR

Publication Information

KNOW

the following

Source Information

the following

the following

the following

the following

the following

the following

An Answer to the Preface.

SIR,

THERE were in my Letter to you three heinous Crimes laid to your Charge, Socinianism, p. 8. & 27. Blasphemy, p. 6. and Apostacy, p. 1. The first of these you do not deny, I take it therefore to be confess'd. The Second you plead to, which in its due place shall be considered; and the Third you are startled at; and enquire, when was the Time, where was the Place, who was the Person, to whom you denied your Christian Name. Pr. For the last, I suppose you denied it to me, when you subscribed your Christian Name with an N. and you should have known both time, and place, had you dated your Letter as you ought to have done.

This Apostacy of yours you hope to excuse, by pretending you meant only to conceal your Name, for many Reasons that you give; all which are resolvable into this one, That you durst not discover it. But in my small Judgment there is a great deal of difference, betwixt concealing a True Name, and imposing upon the World by a False Name. The one may be done in Humility, but the other cannot be done but by Apostacy, or Knavery; and if to avoid the more aggravated guilt of the one, you will submit to the Censure of the other, I will not insist upon it, but will leave you to your choice?

But I much wonder with what face you could justify your Cowardice, to say no worse, by your Example of the Author of the Whole Duty of Man, Pr. For, tell me, Friend, did he pretend a false Name, as you seem to have done. But had you follow'd his Example (which you untruly pretend to have done) would his Case and yours have been the same. He doth a Publick Good, and to avoid all appearance of Vain-Glory conceals his Name: You do a Personal Mischief, and Strab a Man in the dark, and for fear of suffering Justice, skulk and lie hid. But this is the Trade that you, and your Friends about Manchester of late have driven: You take the liberty to abuse and helpe People, and save your back by concealing your Names. The Notemaker is justly Chastiz'd by the Reverend Mr. G. for this. And I suppose (if you did not write) you may have seen A Letter from a Gentleman in Manchester to his Friend, concerning a Notorious Blasphemer, who died in Despair, Dated Dec. 10th, 1694. which is nothing else but a Notorious Lie, as appears by a Certificate of

the

See Res 7 Nov 40 May 90 = 2 p 5 v 1 v

An Answer to the Preface.

the Neighbourhood, Signed by above twenty Persons, which I have by me, and my Friend in a short time may perhaps see it; and this Gentleman is without name also.

You disclaim all knowledge of the Title which your Letter bears, The Lancashire-Levite, Pr. & Pt. p. 1. Truth is it was but borrow'd Wit, from another Scurrilous Pamphlet, call'd The Welsh Levite, or David Jones told in a Blanket: But if it became not your Gravity, why do you repeat it in your 2d Letter? There are a sort of People that will confess their Sins freely, as if that would atone for them, but they are not much inclined to reform and forsake them.

One would think your Conscience pricked you for your Unchristian Reflections on the Dead, but I suppose you think Company will give you some ease, and therefore you would bring me in for a share. I might ask, where make I these Reflections? you say on Hildertham, and Jesse Bee, and 17 for ought you know, Pr. Do you do me Justice, Friend? Did I make any Reflections on them? or said one syllable of them more than what was in a Quotation that I made. If you begin falsely to scandalize me thus soon, I am like to have a sweet Friend of you before you have done.

As for naming Mr. Pendleberry in words at length, the Author of his Life made it necessary, had not he related it from the Press, and made it publick; it, and twenty such Peccadillos as those are, should in favour to my Friend's Friends have been pass'd over, and conniv'd at by me.

The last part of your Preface puts me in mind of what our Saviour saith of the Scribes and Pharisees, Mat. 23. v. 2, 3. who sitting in Moses's seat, he chargeth his Disciples, to observe and do whatsoever they bid them observe; but (saith he) Do not ye after their works, for they say, and do not. Just so my Friend exposeth very handsomely the mischief of Evil Surmings, and groundless Suspicions: He hath said well, what doth he do? why, he falls immediately in the very self same Page of abusing his Neighbours, as if he scorn'd to observe the Rules that he laid down for others to walk by; like the Pharisees, it was sufficient for him to say, and so he leaves it for others to do.

If what he say be true, I thank God, there are no such Persons within the verge of my Friendship; and since he intimates them to be alive, I leave them to answer for themselves, and him for those his Invidious Reflections, which he saith are an Indication of a Corrupt and Rotten Heart, and of a Weak Cause, Pr. to be Self-Condemned by his own Doctrine.

POPERY,

POPERY, SUPERSTITION,

Ignorance and Knavery,

Confess'd, and fully proved on the *Surey*
Dissenters, &c.

C H A P. I.

Of the Charge of Popery.

SO Honest was my Friend in his Vindication of the *Surey* Ministers from the guilt of Popery, that he pretended I had charged them with, *that he could not (as I observed) find one place in all my Book to fix the Charge on, or else he found it so fully proved, that he saw it necessary to connive at it.* But now he will mend the matter, and because in *hast* I over-look'd my Charge of it, he promiseth to shew it me, p. 1. and he saith it is in these words of my Preface. The Foundation whereof I am an Unworthy Member, being intended for the Preservation of his Majesty's Subjects from falling into Errors, especially such as tend to Popery. And a late Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled the *Surey Demoniac*, looking that way, &c. Here (saith he) is your Charge, p. 1. Is this All? I shall in a trice discharge my self of it; for is every thing that tends to Popery, and looks that way, forthwith Popery? Popery it self came not into the Church but by degrees, and that Pamphlet I take to be one step to it, and a large one too; but as I never said it was Popery, so I must say my Friend is a false Witness; and since this is all his Charge, I may leave his Dissenting Friends to be Judges, whether this will amount to proof or no: Here is a Scandalous Pamphlet looks toward Popery, therefore it is Popery: Strong Proof.

Upon this, he now pretends that I drop'd the Charge, p. 1. that is, he basely abused me, in laying that to my Charge which he could

could not prove, as appears plainly from the last Paragraph, which is all the Evidence he hath for his Scandal, and now he would cover his own Shameful Guilt, by making the World believe that I dropt the Charge. I was writing a matter of Fact, and what had I to do with Popery; any farther than as the Agents were Tools in it; this I signified to the World, and my Friend neither in his first nor second Letter so much as endeavours to clear the Dissenting Ministers at *Survey* from it, so conscious was he of the guilt of their Ministry.

I had call'd the *Survey* Ministers *Constant Tools of Popery*, and the word *Constant* he had a mind to strain to the whole Party of Dissenters; on which account I was forc'd to ask him; *whose Tools they were in cutting off the Royal Martyr's Head? If you want Information* (it follows as imprinted) *Philanax Anglicus will tell you.* Here he thinks to maul me, but he only runs his own head against the wall; for he tells me the Author of that Book was a Papist, and that Dr. Du-Moulin answer'd it; which is very true, but what he tacks to it is very untrue; for he saith, *that I brought that Book to prove that they (viz. the Dissenters) cut off the Royal Martyr's Head*, p. 2. That the Dissenters bloody Murder of him, enroll'd him amongst Martyrs is true enough; but that I brought that Book to prove it, is notoriously false; for all that I intended, was to prove that the Fanatick Rebels were therein Tools of Popery; to evince which, I refer'd him to that very Book of Dr. Du-Moulin's, which he himself refers to; only thro' mistake, these words (*the Answer to*) which should have preceeded *Philanax Anglicus* were omitted: There are other such Faults in the Impression, which had been out several Weeks before I so much as knew of it, and therefore could not correct it. I will tell my Friend another, which since he took no notice of, I suppose I have rightly hit on the Author of Mr. Penderberry's Life, viz. Mr. O. H. (after which Letter, P. 11. should have follow'd, *If he was the Author*) which was more than I then knew, but now I may almost believe. And now let me repeat my Question, *whose Tools were Dissenters when they cut off the Royal Martyr's Head? If you want Information, The Answer to Philanax Anglicus will tell you.* This Book, viz. Dr. Du-Moulin's Answer, call'd *A Vindication of*, &c. fully proves the Papists to have been the Contrivers and Projectors of that Bloody Scene; and all the World knows that the Dissenters were the unhappy Actors of it. And now let my Friend (if he dare shame the Devil by speaking Truth) speak out, and tell me from the Book that he allows *whose Tools those Regicides were.*

For their Extemporary Prayers, which they call a Praying by the Spirit, and which they oppose to a sober Form of Publick Worship, I refer'd him to *Foxes and Fire-brands*, a Book that shows them to be of a Popish Original, and Design; and from which the

the Right Reverend and most Learned Bishop of *Worcester* hath clearly manifested the Leading Men of the Faction in those days to have been Papists, under the disguise of Puritans. *Hist. of the Separation.* But what saith my Friend to the Book: He dares not touch it, for fear his Fingers should be either Bit, or Burn'd by it, and so God b' w' ye.

For Answer to my Objection of the Addressees of the Dissenters to *K. James*; that for so long a time stuff'd our Gazettes, and the preference of their Service to a Popish King, whom they waited on at *Chester*, neglecting the King of Heaven on his own Day, he refers me to Cart loads of *Addressees, Abhorrences, Cursings, &c.* P. 3. but he doth not tell me whence they came: So that from his knowledge of them, I may justly conclude them to come from his Friends. For in the very next Lines he takes notice of *Right Rev. and Rev. Caresses at Chester, and the Clergy meeting him also*, lb. But did any of the Clergy neglect the Service of God on the Lord's Day, as the Dissenters did? If not, my Friend is as faulty in his Recriminations, as he was false in his Charges, for that was it I laid to their Charge; nor can his allusion to the Innocent Dove apologize for any Carnivorous Ravens. *Non Veniam Corvis.*

His next words are these. *Now how should Dissenters please some Fools? One while they are the Papists Tools for their Disloyalty, and in the next breath, they are Tools for their Loyalty.* Why, the Fool is well pleas'd with the measure his Friend hath given of Dissenters Loyalty; for he finds him plainly intimating, that if a King be on the Throne that would overthrow the Establishment of the Church of *England*, and bring in Popery, as King *James* the Second is supposed to design, then the Dissenters are Loyal, and his humble Subjects, and are ready to joyn the Papists in it. Not a word Friend of being *Tools of Popery*. Hush Man! But if a King be on the Throne, that endeavours her Welfare, and prefers it to his Life, as the Royal Martyr did, then they are Disloyal; and if they think it a Disparagement to be *the Papists Tools* therein, and will arrogate to themselves the Honour of the Hellish Contrivance, as well as the more than Pagan Execution, they may if they please Crown their Temples with Cypress, and fancy it to be *Lawrel*. But my Friend needs not to make it a wonder, that the Dissenters, as the Spirit moves, are now *Loyal*, and now *Disloyal*; for there are more Time-servers, than the Old Vicar of *Bray*.

My Friend next tells me *that we and Dissenters are agreed in our Loyalty*, lb. If so, I pray God continue them in it, and keep them from changing; but then in the Person of a *Jacobite* he hath a mind to twit us with the *Doctrine of Non-Resistance, and Passive-*

Obedience, which are the Security of any Government; and which (the *Jacobites* in a Piece that I never yet heard was answer'd are told) were nothing concern'd in the Late Revolution. But my Friend if he can but have a sling at the Church of *England*, cares not now to personate a pert Scotch Presbyterian, and now a *Jacobite*; and we shall before we come to the end, hear him plead for the *Pope*, and for the *Turk*; for he will be an Advocate for any one but a Church of *England* Man; and he thinks he can mischief such an one most, by pretending himself his Friend.

If the next Period be not false Pointed, we have another Instance of my Friend's Integrity; he saith, *For Mr. J's Speech, and Dissenters Addresses, at that time you mention; there was none presented, nor did Mr. J. make a Speech, P. 3.* Now I mentioned no time at all of Addresses being presented; for every Gazette for I know not how long together was stuff with them: I suppose therefore the Semicolon should have been after Addresses. And for the Speech which he denies Mr. J. made, he plays upon the word *make*, which sometimes signifies to speak a Speech which one hath already made: Now I did not say that Mr. J. spoke a Speech, as Mr. A. and others did; but that he made a Speech, i. e. composed one, though he was disappointed of showing his Oratory, which I am told fell out thus.

The Dissenters, Independant and Presbyterian, in one Body drew up together on a Common, or Heath, some few Miles from *Chester*, over which the King was to pass, where they intended to Salute him with an Harangue, and Mr. J. claim'd that Province to be His, by virtue of his Seniority: But the Presbyterians would not yield that an Independant, as Mr. J. is, should carry off the Bell; nor would Mr. J. recede from the Privilege which his Age intitled him to. Upon this Difference, the King pass'd by Uncongratulated by a Speech, and Mr. J. lost the opportunity of being claw'd for an Orator.

But to return. I had charg'd my Friend, *P. 6.* in his heat of Apologizing for the *Surey Divines*, of laying down such a Principle as would justify the *Papists*, the *Quakers*, with all the other *Spawn of Fanaticism*, in their Impious Superstition, and that was, that he allows Supposition to be a Ground of Devotion: For then, by way of Confutation I argued, that if the Supposition was false, the Worship must be Superstition. To this he replies that Mr. J. and the rest, did not make a Supposition of it; for they did verily believe that D. was a Demoniack, *P. 3.* So say I; Mr. Pope, and the rest, do not make a supposition of it, but do verily believe that there is a Purgatory; and offer to prove it, which is more than Mr. J. and the rest have done for D's Demonianism. If my Friend was but a Cardinal, he might bid fair for the Infallible Chair

Chair at the next Conclave; for such Divinity as this is, could not but merit it.

But now my Friend thinks he can clench the Nail, for he hath so good an Opinion of me, as to hope that *When I am absent from my Wife and Children, I may pray for them, supposing and believing them to be alive; but it is possible at the same time some of them may be Dead.* Hereupon he demands, *Will this Supposition, which is not then True, make your Prayers Superstition.* P. 4. Friend, I wonder what Quack in Divinity was your Tutor, or who taught you that such Prayers, as are last mentioned, are founded upon Supposition. For tell me, doth not God Command this. If he do? and my Friend, tho' he had a Forehead of Brais dares not deny it, then the ground of my Devotion, is the Command of God, who requires my Prayers for them, when I am absent from them, as well as present with them, and not the supposition of my Friend. And the supposition he mentions, is merely accidental, arising from an Inseparable Adjunct of Humane Nature, viz. Our Imperfection. That the Dissenters may see what a Doughty Champion they have got, my Friend's Argument for them is thus:

God Almighty hath commanded me to pray for my Wife and Children; in obedience to whose Commands I pray for them, supposing them to be Alive, tho' tis possible (I being but a Man that knows not all things, and absent from them) some of them may be Dead: Therefore it is Lawful for the *Surrey* Ministers on a Groundless Supposition, that *D.* had a Devil; and the Romish Priests on a groundless Supposition, that there are Souls in Purgatory; to pray unto God to cast a Devil out of one, and the poor Souls out of the other. *Jo. Triumphe.*

I had like to have pass'd over his Innuendo, truly Fanatical, and then in his next Letter, he would have said I had not answer'd him: It is in this Query, P. 4. *Whether is it more Excusable, He that Adores the Sacrament of the Altar, that believes Christ is there Personally, &c. or he that Adores the Altar?* (he should have told us who this was; I know none such, nor I believe he neither: For his Conscience, even such as it is, yet seems to check him for it, in the next words, tacitly confessing the precedent to be a Scandal) or before it, saith he; by which last words, he may mean *Solomon*, for he pray'd before the Altar, as I read 1 Kings 8. Or *Hezekiah*, for he order'd *Judah* and *Jerusalem* to worship before the Altar there, 2 Kings 18. 22. Or for ought I know, he may have a mind to reprimand our Saviour, who in his Instructions to the Penitent that had wrong'd his Brother, advis'd him to *Leave his Gift before the Altar, and go his way, first be reconciled to his Brother, and then come and offer his Gift*, Matth. 5. 24. This Friend of mine suffers neither God, nor Man, neither Prince, nor Prophet to escape his Rebukes; and the *Lancashire-Levite* cannot but

esteem it a Felicity, that his Friend is pleas'd to joyn him with such blessed Company.

By this you may see the Temper of my Friend. The Papists that adore the Sacrament of the Altar, are more excusable with him, than *Solomon*, *Hezekiah*, and the *Lancashire-Levite*, that adore before it; and I desire to know whether I may not justly reckon this my Friend amongst the *Tools of Popery*, who here becomes an Advocate for its grossest Idolatry.

And how far he hath dipt his fingers in it, one may understand from what next follows, which is a pitiful Evasion becoming only a Papist, or such a Man as I take my Friend to be. I had accused him for *Falsly Charging me with what I never said*, and pretending that a base Suggestion of his own, was my Opinion. This Wickedness which is as ill if not worse than Forgery; for that Counterfeits but a Man's Hand, whereas this Counterfeits his Judgment, he softly calls a *Misrepresenting my words*, P. 4. When as himself had not so much as quoted one word of mine to give Colour to a Misrepresentation, but the whole was his own Invention: And all that he hath to come off with, is, *That he will tell me, why he judged the Argument to be mine*, P. 4. But what's that to me; if he should take an Honest Woman for an Whore, pray who is in the fault, or what satisfaction would it be to hear some impertinent Reasons why he did so; especially if whilst the Satyr was Apologizing for his mistake, he should renew his insolence; which my Friend doth in the very next Page, only moderating his false Imputation with these words, *If I mistake not*, P. 5. when all the World may see, that he willfully Mistakes.

This is all my Friend hath to say on this Head of Popery, and whether he hath Vindicated himself, or his Dissenting *Rabbies* from being Tools of it, I leave the Reader to Judge.

CHAP. II.

Of the Charge of Superstition.

MY Friend's Ingenuity I could not forbear observing in my Answer, *who made me to charge Dissenters with Superstition, and yet did not so much as produce one place in all my Book to prove his Charge*. And was not this done like an honest Man? But now he will mend the matter, for he finds the word *Superstition* in my Preface; and afterwards takes notice that *I honestly confess the Charge*, P. 6. But why doth he not take notice, that in that
very

very same place, and from his own Letter I make good the Charge; telling him, that *I would Condemn him out of his own mouth, P. 7.* and was as good as my word. This he calls unmannerly Rhetorick, but over-bore with the Evidence of Truth, hath not so much as one word to reply to it.

Thus leaving his Dissenters under the Confessed Guilt of Superstition, he begins to think how to shift for himself; and answer that Indictment of Blasphemy, which upon his Notion of *Δασιδαίμονια*, signifying, as he saith, *A Fearing of Demons, or Worshipping of Devils*, I had brought against him. And here he struggles like a Beast in the Toils, who is thereby more entangled. He saith the Heathens in this place took *Δαίμονιον*, which Title they give to Christ, *in a bad sense, P. 7.* Let him prove that, and I will acquit him; but this is notoriously false, as who ever will read the Chapter may see; for *some desired to hear St. Paul again of this matter, Acts 17. 32. and others were converted by him, v. 34.* So that they must of necessity by *Δαίμονιον* understand the True God. Then for his Argument, that it must signify a False God, because he is call'd a strange God, that is only to give St. Paul the Lye, who in this very Chapter, *v. 23, 24, &c.* explains the *Unknown God*, to be the Strange God; and if this little Spark of a Friend of mine, had known any thing of the *Pantheon at Rome*, he would not have said that all *Strange Gods* were by the Heathens esteemed *False Gods*.

The Guilt of Blasphemy he cannot avoid, pray God he repent of it; but to raise a mist before the Reader's Eyes, that he may not discern it, he saith that *I accuse him falsely. He did not say the Greek word (viz. Δασιδαίμονια) signified wholly a Worshipping or Fearing of Demons, P. 7.* Nor did I ever say he did; He may find the word *wholly* if his Spectacles do not blind his Eyes, in a different Character from what I quoted from him; the one being Roman, the other *Italian*. But the thing was, he was to cry up a new Question; and therefore whilst he pretends that *I falsely accuse him*, whosoever hath eyes to discern between the Roman, and *Italian* Letters, may plainly see that *Wilsfully* at least, if not *Maliciously* he abused me.

As for his Wit (which is the first that I have met with, for my Friend grows dull, and I almost repent that I reproved him for his Scurrility, since I find he cannot be *Ludicrous*, as he Phraseth it, unless he must be *Scurrilous*; and I had rather he should show his parts any way, than show none at all; as for his Wit) *What Paul! would you have Men to worship Demons? why Christ is a Demon, &c.* It only discovers that he doth not understand why Evil Spirits were termed *Δαίμονια*, and so in one stroke he both betrays his Ignorance, (a Grace he mentions, *P. 8.*) and Blasphemes his Saviour.

He

He hath one thing more, under this Head, P. 8. for It was Queried, Where we were commanded to bow to the East? or before the Altar to make Courtesies—— And Bouncing and Racketing, Priest one verse, and People another. Is this for Edification, P. 8.

In answer to the pert *Scotchman*, I Query again where these things are forbidden; for it they be neither commanded nor forbidden, I hope we are left to our Liberty; and I know not why I may not as well Worship to the East, as he to the West; and if I must use his Phrase, make Courtesies before the Altar, as I have shew'd that *Solomon*, &c. did, as well as he affront it, by turning his Posteriors upon it. As for your *Bouncing, and Racketing*, pray send your next Rebuke to God Almighty, and dispute with him, why he allows this *Bouncing and Racketing in Heaven*, One Angel crying to another, *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory, Esa. 6. 3.* And this Alternation in Divine Worship you find again exemplified in the fourth and fifth Chapters of the *Revelations*, where there are such *Bouncing and Racketing* (as you Prophanely Phrase it) betwixt the four *Living* Angels I suppose (most properly so call'd, because of their Immortal Life) and the Twenty Four Elders that had Crowns of Gold upon their Heads. I find you are loath to forbear Bordering upon Blasphemy; for who that had any fear of God before him, durst term such Adoration as the Angels pay, a *Bouncing and Racketing*. Pray tell me, Why may not the Priests and People of the Church of England, Bounce and Racket about *David's Psalms*, as well as the Angels in Heaven Bounce and Racket about *Esa's Hymn*. Is this Language becoming Devotion? or can the Reader take my Friend to be any thing but an Apostate, or Atheist? I cannot but remember what the Archangel said to the Devil, *Jude, v. 9. The Lord rebuke thee.* But I am thinking, if my Friend, and his pert *Scotch* Presbyterian should chance to go to Heaven, whether coming near the Gates, and hearing Angels, and Saints *Bouncing and Racketing* about the aforesaid Hymns, they would not take it to be an Assembly of the Church of England, and hanging down their heads, sneak back again into some Dark Conventicle.

That my Friend may not take Silence to be Consent, P. 9. I have answer'd his *Mundunguffs*, and leave both his, and Dissenting Friends hands full of Superstition.

CHAP. III.

Of Schismatical Divisions.

SPEAKING of the *Unchristian Divisions* which Dissenters make from the Established Church, I took notice *P. 7.* that my Friend did not pretend to vindicate them (as in the other heads) from the Guilt of it, for the Crime is so Notorious that Men see it with their Eyes, (where by the bye, that my Friend may blind Men's Eyes, for fear they should see it, he leaves out this passage in his Quotation, *P. 9.* like such an honest man as he is) but he endeavours to justify them in it; and what saith he to this? Why he confesseth, *It is thus far True that he Vindicates them not from some Divisions, but Justifies them: i.e. going to another place, from the Church of Wigan, to Billinge-Chappel, or St. Helen's.* I cannot think my Friend so weak, as to think himself that he Argues pertinently; for thus lieth his Argument, It is Lawful for me to go, and serve God at *Wigan Church*, or at *Billinge-Chappel*, where the Worship of God is one and the same; nor is there any Division in it, but that of place, one being three Miles distant from the other; therefore I may also go to *St. Helen's*, where there is a Presbyterian Meeting, and where there is also a Quaker's Meeting, both which separate from the Church of England in the manner of their Worship; for it is but going to another place, as from *Wigan* to *Billinge*, only it is a few Miles farther, and he understands no Crime in either, &c. My Friend hath lost either his Understanding or Honesty, or he could never have pretended that they are as justifiable from the guilt of Schism and Division, that go to *St. Helen's*, as they are that go to *Billinge-Chappel*, as if the diversity of the Place, was all the guilt of the Division.

But he will justify them from *Divisions in Doctrine*, for they subscribe all the Articles concerning Doctrine, *P. 9.* Do they so? then they must subscribe them all, for they are all Doctrinal, even those that relate to Discipline. This Friend of mine regards not what he saith, or writes; he knows the Dissenters refuse to subscribe some Articles, all which as I have said are Doctrinal, and yet he hath the Confidence to assert, that they subscribe all the Articles concerning Doctrine. But perhaps by *Doctrine* he will say he means only the Fundamental Principles of Religion, and then perhaps would engage him on this head, and assert some of those Doctrines in which they dissent from us, to be Fundamentals; but because he is my Friend, I will let that pass, repeating only what I before said, that this is not sufficient to clear them

them from the Sin of Schism, from *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram* opposed no Articles of the Jewish Doctrine that ever I heard of, and yet he knows what befell them for endeavouring to make a Division in the Church; for he tells me he hath often heard of these three Men, P. 9. and he is like to hear of them once more, for I had said P. 8. *That my Friend who undertook to Vindicate the Dissenters in this Case of Division, would in his next I suppose Vindicate Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, against the Lancashire-Levite, that had made them Schismatics: And he offers fairly at it, for for his words are these; If really they Subscribed the Articles of the Jewish Faith, then in That, they were neither Hereticks, nor Schismatics, P. 10. My Friend is the first, and I believe will be the last that will in any wise undertake the Patronage of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram: For though he thinks by his Sophistical Restriction of the Relative That, to save the Reputation of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, with his Beloved Dissenters from the Scandal of Division, I must tell him that it was that very thing, which in their insolence against Moses made them Schismatics, and not Hereticks. The Case, because I intend to run the parallel with it, about Wigan Church, and St. Helen's Chappel, is this.*

Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, admitted the same Articles of Jewish Doctrine that Moses did; just as my Friend saith, that the Dissenters Subscribe all the Articles of the Doctrine of the Church of England; the Difference was about the Persons of the Governours, whether Aaron and his Posterity were to hold the Priesthood, Numb. 16. v. 3. 10. as it is with us, whether Bishops and their Successors are to Rule the Church. Upon this difference, Dathan and Abiram seem to have set up a private Conventicle, in opposition to Moses and Aaron, and designed Corah for the Chief Priest; as our Dissenters set up Conventicles in opposition to the Bishops, and set up Men of their own Faction to be their Ministers therein. This appears plain, from Dathan and Abiram's refusing to joyn with Moses in the place of Worship; for when he sent for them, they refused to come up, saying, we will not come up; v. 12, 14. but would serve God in the place they then were; as appears from those words of Moses to the Lord, Respect not thou their Offerings, v. 15. which clearly signifie, that they intended an Oblation or Sacrifice to God, in the place where they were, as distinct and separate from that of Moses; as our Dissenters now set up St. Helen's, and such like Places to Preach and Pray in, in opposition to Billinge Chappel, and our other Churches. Upon this Moses makes an Appeal to God, and orders Corah and his Company to bring with them Censers, and meet Aaron at the Door of the Tabernacle the day following, that God might approve of his own Ministers. Corah and moit

of his Accomplices accept of the Proposal, and meet *Aaron* the day following; and in what a dreadful manner God exemplified his Indignation against those Dissenters, (tho' I find it is not fear'd) is not unknown to my Friend.

If these Papers should come to any Dissenters hand, that means more honestly than my Friend doth, and hath no mind to fall into *Corah's* Sin, much less to Patronize it, I desire him again and again to peruse that Sixteenth Chapter of *Numbers*, and seriously to consider, as behoves a Man that is concern'd in it, whether the Guilt of *Corah* and his Party, was not, as I have proved from *ver. 3.* and *10.* an opposition to their Lawful Church Governours, and setting up a place for Divine Worship separate and distinct from the Tabernacle, *ver. 12, 14, 15.* For if this be so, then to avoid the guilt of *Corah's* Sin, it is not enough to own and admit the Doctrines of a Church, for that *Corah* did; but they must peaceably submit to its Governours, and not oppose them, by setting up other Ministers, and other Worship against them, for that was *Corah's* Sin; and it deeply concerns my Friend, and such as he pleads for, to take care that it may not be theirs.

I cannot but observe how studious my Friend is to abuse the more honest, but too Credulous Dissenters, in endeavouring by these words, *In that they were neither Hereticks, nor Schismaticks*, to make them believe that *Corah* was no Schismatick, i. e. Dissenter; for if they were once convinced of that, they would pass another judgment on those Divisions that they make amongst us, than now they do; and yet he dares not, nor doth not deny but that was *Corah's* sin; only by that Sophistical and deceitful Expression he endeavours to conceal it from them, for fear, lest if they saw the danger, he should lose them.

But Dissenters say, *They separate not from their Lawful Church Governours, P. 10.* So *Corah* and his Party said to *Moses* and *Aaron*, *ye lift up your selves (וַיִּשָּׁאוּ) in the High-priest, you make your selves (וַיִּשָּׂאוּ) Governours, for God did not make you such) over the Congregation of the Lord, v. 3. And till they be proved such Separatists, they are not to be charged with sinful Divisions, lb.* The Proof is easie.

The Bishops of the Land, both by the Laws of God and Man are our Lawful Church Governours.

But the Dissenters divide from these Bishops.

Therefore they Divide from their Lawful Church-Governours, and consequently by their own Confession, are justly charged with sinful Divisions.

I shall pass by the other Impertinencies of this Chapter; as when I had proved from the Identity of the word *Schism*, and

Division, that the Dissenters separation from us was a Schism, and therefore Unchristian; he not being able to answer it, cries our very ignorantly, *Sylogizari non est ex particulari*, P. 10. as if Identity and Particularity were the same. Yet he will venture to tell me that all Divisions are not Unchristian; for if so, then we in this Diocese divide from Chester Cathedral, P. 10. Yes! just as St. Paul divided from the Church of Corinth, when he was absent from them in Body, but present in Spirit, 1 Cor. 5. 3. My Friend hath rare Notions of the Unity of Christ's Church, since he placeth it thus in Locality; for if this his Notion of Division be true, since the Church of Christ is the Body of Christ, he hath made him to have more Bodies than all the Priests that belong to Rome do make him on a *Corpus Christi* Day.

But that Learned Man that called Schism an Ecclesiastical *Scavo-Crown*, tho' I call him a Socinian, was certainly a Church of England Man, P. 10. This is the first time that ever I heard that Socinians were of the Church of England; and if I thought my Friend spoke Truth, I would leave that Communion, and take Sanctuary under the Act of Toleration. But my Comfort is, my Friend doth not regard Truth in his Writing, and therefore I cannot believe what he saith: Accordingly I find the Fundamental Articles of that Church are diametrically opposite to Socinianism, how then can a Socinian be of it? Why, just as he tells us a Papist may be, *Ib.* Right, my Friend hath a Noddle of Gold, and Rich Thoughts must needs flow from it; for

Dissenters think the Protestants Arguments against the Church of Rome, will justify their present partial withdrawing from the Church of England, P. 11. and of this General Argument I take notice, *Ib.* No indeed; for what is it to me, what Dissenters think; I would not think as they do for all the World. But since you are so often telling me what Dissenters think of us, pray, for once, let me tell you what I think of you, and this your Argument. For you, I think your Conscience flew in your face when you writ it, as knowing that it was false, and therefore you Father it upon Dissenters thoughts; Dissenters think say you, &c. For your Argument it is thus: The Church of England departed from the Church of Rome, because in their Forms of Divine Worship, they pray'd *Ave Maria*, &c. Therefore the Dissenters may depart from the Church of England, because in their Forms of Divine Worship, they pray *Our Father*, &c. The Church of England left that of Rome, because she made the Pope the Head of Christ's Church: Therefore the Dissenters may leave the Church of England, because they make the King the Defender of Christ's Faith. In short, hath the Church of England made any New Articles of Faith, as that of Rome hath done: If she hath not, there is not the same Reason for Dissenters to separate from

from her, that she had to separate from the Church of Rome; and if she hath, why doth not my Friend shew them us? After all, the Case is not parallel, for the Church of Rome had no Authority over us, and therefore we might leave her Communion when we pleased: But I hope the King, the Parliament, and Convocation have Authority in Church as well as State, over the Dissenters, and therefore that might be Lawful for us, who were no way subject to the Pope, that cannot be lawful to them who are subject to the King in his Parliament, and Convocation. Well, my Friend is one of a thousand, a knowing Man, and wonderful fit to make a Chair-Man of, and propose terms of Accommodation, as in this Chapter he hath insolence to do; but as the Proverb will inform us what sort of Cattel they are that will be meddling, so the ignorance my Friend discover'd in the last instance, shews how little qualified he is for it: Accordingly, no sooner is he stept into the Chair, but he gives us evident proof of his Fallibility; for he Dogmatically affirms, that the Church of England have it in their Power at any time to remove the Schism so much complain'd of; for take but away (saith he) all that Christ hath not commanded, as Terms of Communion, and the Schism ceaseth, P. 21. If this were true, how came there to be so many Divisions in the time of Rebellion, when the Church of England and her Injunctions were trodden under foot? nor is my Friend's assertion true, that if the Church would but take away what Christ hath not commanded, the Schism would cease; for there is no Confutation like what is Experimental; and I will tell you a passage that happened in this Parish of Wigau, since I sent you the former Letter.

There was a Neighbouring Gentlewoman that had been brought up in the Church of England, and continued in that Communion, till six or seven years ago; about which time she was prevailed with to go to the Conventicles, which whilst she was able, she frequented, tho' she never received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at their hands: For when she was pressed to it, she desired that she might see the way and manner of their Administration of it, before she her self Communicated with them, which was allowed her; and she disapproving of their way, never (as I said) did Communicate with them in that Sacrament.

It pleased God not long after, to Visit her with a tedious and grievous Distemper, of which she died; and the Minister to whose Conduct she had committed her self, Visiting her in her Distress; one time, amongst other Discourses, she asked him, If it should please God to recover her, whether he would not be pleas'd to Administer the Eucharist to her kneeling? He ask'd her, what made her propose to him that Question? She reply'd, that she was not at all satisfied with the Posture the Presbyterians Received it in; adding as a Reason, that she had been brought up in

the way of the Church of England. He return'd, that he had been also brought up in that way; and yet he never did Receive that Sacrament kneeling. She asked him, if he ever did receive that Sacrament in the Church, and he confess'd he never did. But, faith she, I have; and prefer Kneeling, for the Reverence it shew's, unto the other Posture. Hereupon he grew angry, and declin'd against Kneeling at the Eucharist, as a work of Supererogation, and made an heavy outcry of the Popery of it. But she unmoved with his noise, argued, that the Posture was look'd upon as a thing indifferent, and that she knew some good Men of the Presbyterian way, that had Administr'd it to some (who had desir'd it) kneeling. Perhaps so (saith he) in Charles

the Second's time; but now (saith he) we have an Indulgence. Right (saith she) and therefore you may allow me the liberty of my Conscience. No, (replys he) Now we

have Power to order things in our own way. Then (she return'd) I perceive the Indulgence is only to strengthen your Power, and not at all to ease our tender Consciences.

The Presbyterians now they have a shadow of Power, are as stiff for their Ceremonies as others.

The Danger that Extemporary Prayer exposeth one to.

After Prayer she renew'd again (if I mistook her not, for whether it was before or after, I did not rightly apprehend; but she again renew'd) her Request, that he would allow her (if she recover'd) to receive that Sacrament kneeling in Private. In Private (saith he) what do you mean by that? I do not mean (saith she) any Private Communion; but that you would Administr it to me kneeling so privately, that I may not be an Offence to the rest of your Congregation; but he absolutely denied her. She told him that Christ Administr'd the Eucharist to his Apostles in a posture that was different both from Sitting, and kneeling; and therefore he might Administr it to her in the one Posture as well as the other. But neither Arguments nor Entreaties would prevail with him to comply with her desires. Upon this he left her, and though her Distemper increased upon her daily, and there was no hopes of Life, he never, as she said, came near her afterwards.

It is not Ear Ceremonies that occasion the Schism.

The Care that the Dissenting Ministers have of their dying Members, if they chance to disoblige them.

She

She being thus deserted by her Minister, lay languishing, and could not out of shame (as she acknowledged) send for me, because she had withdrawn her self from the Church, tho' it was before I came there: But Death sensibly approaching (and she having I believe an Intimation given her how ready I should be to attend her, if I thought my presence might be acceptable; tho' at that time I had not heard the least syllable of what is here related) on *April* last, the 14. Day, she sent to desire I would Visit her, which I did the same Day; and then in the presence of some that went with me, and those that attended her, I received from her own mouth the Account here given, which left my Memory should tell me, I forthwith committed to Writing, to keep it by me. The Gentlewoman after this received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at my hands, and died in the Communion she was brought up in, a Pious and Devout Christian.

I dare now leave even my byas'd Friend to Judge whether the Expedient he hath propos'd in these words, *Take but away all that Christ hath not commanded, as Terms of Communion, and the Schism ceases*, be of any efficacy. It seems there are other Men that are as stiff for their Ceremonies (tho' they have not the same Authority) as we are, and till they be of a more meek and humble temper, such as my Friend may unjustly complain of the Church, but his pretending, Saints must answer God for the guilt.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Charge of Ignorance.

IN my Reply to my Friend's Letter upon this Head, I had these words, *The Truth is, I find that I charge them home either with Ignorance, or Neglect*, P. 12. And how do you think this honest Friend of mine represents this? Why, he thinks the word *Neglect*, may justly be neglected; for had he infested it, it would have proved, that his Accusation was false, and he no Friend of mine, but a Scandalous Libeller: And his Crime is yet so much the blacker, in that I complain'd of this very piece of Injustice he did me in my other Letter, and yet here he repeats it; which makes me wonder whether my Friend hath a Conscience, or no; for I cannot think he hath any; for thus he goes on, *You acknowledge you charge them home with Ignorance* omitting the other words, *or Neglect*, and that you are still of the same mind. And give your Reasons why you charged them with Ignorance, be-

cause

cause they could not understand Arabick Characters (this is notoriously false, I said no such thing) and *some Cyphers* (another untruth) and *suffered a Female Fiend to be call'd Ishcol, and at last*, he saith, *I crow, what saith my Friend? Profound Silence!* And, saith he, *you say true in that; for he never undertook to meddle with Matters of Fact*, P. 11, 12. And now hath not my Friend Vindicated them bravely from the Charge of Ignorance that he laid upon them, for that was none of my Charge but his; I conceiv'd the mistake might proceed from neglect; but Ignorance he would have it (and he knows them better than I do) and Ignorance he confesseth it, for he acknowledgeth that I gave Reasons for what I said, to which he hath no other Answer but *Profound Silence*. And now I think my Friend had better have let this Head alone, then expos'd his beloved Dissenters at the rate he here doth.

But though he cannot Vindicate them from Ignorance in matters of Fact, he dares undertake to do it in matter of Argument and is content here to attend a *Trial of Skill*, P. 12. Now, what is the meaning of this? My Friend here confesseth the Dissenters ignorant in the matters of Facts; in the last Chapter, he acknowledgeth them guilty as to some Divisions; as in his former Letter he did, of some Superstition; then he never so much as attempts to clear the *Surey* Ministers from being Tools of Popery, which was all or more than he could pretend I charged them with; and now that he sees that on each Head he is baffled, we must let go matter of Fact, which was all my Impostor insisted on, and divert to matter of Argument. And why this? Why, the well-meaning People of the Party were to be Spirited away into the Land of *Utopia*, that they might not discover the weakness of their Teachers, and my Friend is made the Tool to abuse their Innocence; and now instead of Disputing whether there was a Devil at *Surey* or no; and the Dissenters Tools of Popery? which last he cannot deny; we must Dispute concerning *Bouncing and Racketing of David's Psalms*, and Christ and his Apostles *Lolling* at the Institution of the Sacred Eucharist, with such like Atheistical Speculations, as float abundantly in my Friend's Noddle, and no doubt but he will shew abundance of skill in handling profanely enough whatever tends to expose Religion, and sober Worship, and let us see his Skill.

The first Argument he saith was, *They cannot think it Lawful to command things in the Worship of God of the same Nature, &c. with God's own Appointments*, P. 12. and I intimated to him that the Divines of the Church of England were of the same Mind, and have fully proved that the Ceremonies enjoynd are not of the same Nature with God's appointment; on which Account I said, that my Friend either knew the Doctrine of the Church of England

land in this Point, or he did not: if he did not, it was grossly affected Ignorance in him to assert this, since there were Books enough to Inform him better; if he did, it was a Damnable Scandal, which my Friend ought to repent of, P. 13. What saith my Friend to this? Why he cannot answer it, but bleeds inwardly, and repent he will not; and so he cries of this afterwards, P. 12. In which his usual Honesty takes place; for in all this Chapter there is not a word more of it; and so he hurries on to his *Humane Sacraments*, P. 12. and tells me of *Sacraments Humane, Divine, and Diabolical*, Ib. by which last I suppose he meant to raise up Dicky's Devil to have given Evidence of the Reality of the Possession. But where doth my Friend find the Heathen terming their Mysteries Sacraments, or the Romans their Presh-money, a Sacrament; I challenge my Friend to produce one testimony of it if he can; for the *Sacramentum Militare* was not the Presh-money, but the Oath of Fidelity that attended it. But suppose this was true, when a word is appropriated by long Custom to a certain signification, to insist on its obsolete and various acceptations is very Impertinent and Vain. If my Friend should say the Bible was Holy, which is the Title that it deservedly bears, and I playing on the word Bible (which signifies no more than a Book) as he doth on the word Sacrament, should reply; How Friend, the Bible Holy? Why there are Alcorans, or Humane Bibles, and Diabolical Bibles, and I hope you will not say these are Holy; would not this be very foolish in me. I know not what it may be in my Friend, but another Man might justly call upon me to speak Sense, and Piety. But my Friend fairly confesseth that a Sacrament cannot be Humane; for speaking of the Five Sacraments superadded by the Papists, he asks, *Why will you not admit them to be Sacraments? Is not one Reason, because they are but of Humane Institution*, P. 12, 13. No indeed, Friend, is it not; you shall not be my Champion against the Papists, for they will prove to you that most, if not all of them are of Divine Institution, so Learned a Vindicator is my Friend. But in these words you plainly confess, that one Reason, why a Ceremony, (such as Extream Unction, is according to you) cannot be a Sacrament, is because it is of Humane Institution: For if the Nature of a Sacrament require that the Institution of it should be Divine, you your self see a Contradiction in the Terms, when you speak of an Humane Sacrament, and therefore you deny the Five superadded by the Papists to be Sacraments, which is true enough in themselves, tho' your Reason against them is altogether false.

But what do you mean, when you say, *The Cross is Divine in its End, Use, and Significancy*, P. 13. Do you mean by this to prove it a Sacrament? If so, kneeling upon our knees, lifting up the Hands and Eyes to Heaven in Prayer are Sacraments, for they are

are Divine in their End, Use, and Significancy. Surely my Friend is under some Discipline of Self-Denial, for one would hardly think that one that pretends to be an Author, and a Vindicator too, should be a Man of such weak Parts, as my Friend in his Writings, makes the World believe he is.

Well, that we may part Friends, my Friend is content, that we call it an *Humane Appointment*, P. 13. Say you so, said I? I hold a Penny to a Pot of Ale, that he talks Nonsense within ten Lines, and it immediately follows; *and then is it Lawful for any body to command things in the Worship of God, of the same Nature, &c. i.e. with God's own Appointment*, P. 12. If the Cross be of Humane Institution as you here confess it, how can it be of the same Nature with the Sacraments, which are of Divine Institution. I have read of one *Eutyches* that confounded the Divine and Humane Nature in Christ; I understand you are good at the Art, for you can make Humane Appointments, and Divine Appointments to be of the same Nature; you are really a Theological Alchymist, that can thus extract Divinity out of Humanity. But let us examine the Paragraph as we have it, P. 12. changing the word Sacrament, into that of Appointment, and 'tis thus.

They cannot think it lawful for any body to command things in the Worship of God of the same Nature, Use, Significancy and End with God's own Appointments; when there is no difference, but God commands the one, and Men the other; this is Difference enough to distinguish Ceremonies from Sacraments; this distinguisheth the Bible from the Alcoran. I wonder what difference my Friend would have; for this is the greatest that can be, it being as great as the distance is betwixt Heaven, and Earth, God, and Man, the Creator, and the Creature; but this is next to nothing with my Friend; there is no Difference, saith he, but God commands the one, and Man the other; an inconsiderate thing of small weight with him, and make them necessary Terms of Communion. And thy instance in the Cross about Baptism, a Humane Appointment. He pretends here that our Ceremonies, or at least some of them, as that of the Cross in Baptism, are of the same Nature, Use, Significancy and End, with God's own appointments. As for the Nature of them being the same, since the Institution of the one is Humane, and the other Divine, he talks like a Quack, or a Popish Priest, that can Transubstantiate Nature, and make a Wafer into a God; just as he doth a Ceremony into a Sacrament. Of the same use: I cannot think that my Friend thinks as he writes; for surely he knows that Sacraments convey Grace, which is what I never yet heard taught of Ceremonies of the same significancy: Do you think the Man in earnest; or he is studiously abusing the weakness of his Party, and Buoying them

them up in their prejudices against the Church of England; for Sacraments are Signs, from God to Man; whereas Ceremonies are Signs from Man to God, and is it possible for these to have the same significancy? *Of the same End*, are they so indeed? The End of Sacraments is by the application of the outward Sign to assure the Soul, that is duly qualified, of its receiving the inward Grace; whereas the End of Ceremonies is Uniformity, and Discipline. Now with what face could my Friend brazen it out, that our Ceremonies are of the same Nature, Use, Significancy, and End with God's own Appointments; a Charge which contains as many Untruths, as Words; I must therefore call of him again to repent of this wicked Scandal, whereby he lewdly abuseth a Church, that is the Glory of the Reformation.

In his next Argument he fancies he hath got me in his *Neighbour's Pound*. He had reproachfully affirm'd that we had received the *Posture of Kneeling at Receiving Bread and Wine in the Eucharist*, from the Papists, 1st Letter, P. 5. Hereupon I ask'd him, if the Papists received Wine in that Sacrament? and he thinks to come off with a Jest, by telling me, *the Papists do receive Wine in that Sacrament, unless the Priests be no Papists*, P. 13. Now to catch the Wise Man in his Wisdom, I say the Priest doth not receive pure Wine as we do, for there is Water to be mixed with it: so that we Communicating in pure Wine, (if such Hucksters as he do not abuse us) my Query stands where it was, for a Rebuke to his Profaneness.

Under the next Head, we come to the *Apostle's Lolling at the Lord's Supper*, P. 14. (as according to his wonted Reverence to things Sacred, he is pleas'd to Phrase it.) Well, the Church of England may well pardon him for his Bouncing and Backeting, when he makes the Holy Jesus, and all his Apostles, at the very Institution of the Eucharist to be guilty of Lolling. What must we think will become of Religion, when a Man that pretends to it, speaks thus rudely of the most solemn Action of it? I will tell you, my Friend, something above two years ago, some Popish Priests were here in our Parish for Casting out a Devil, whose Name they said was *Loll*, and Devil turn'd had they perform'd the Conjuraton, to purpose, *Casuisst*, p. 4. as your *Surey* Friends pretended they did; I should verily have concluded that *Loll* the Devil had entred into you, and that he made you talk so Atheistically of the *Apostles Lolling at the Supper of the Lord*. I must again repeat *Michael's* Rebuttal to Satan, *The Lord Rebuke thee, Satan*.

The last was a Noble stroke of my Friend; you shall now hear another of his Fancies, which is, that *The Presbyterians will say they do use the same Posture (viz. with the Apostles) for they sit;*

and tho' he knows the Apostle's Posture was a kind of Leaning, and Lolling in one anothers Bosom; they will say, whatever the Manner was, whether Cross-leg'd (like so many Taylors) or with their Feet under them (why where should they be, would he have had them on their Heads?) or leaning side-way on their Elbow, still it was sitting however, P. 14. He might if he had pleas'd, have put in one posture to have explain'd this their Lolling by, viz. that of Kneeling, and perhaps that would have satisfied the tender Consciences of his honest Dissenters; and to justify him in it, I here give it him under my hand, that whenever he can prove *Leaning side-way on his Elbow* to be *Sitting*, I shall be able to prove *Kneeling* to be so too; and so this Controverfie will be at an end.

But still it sticks on his Stomach, that the Apostles if they were now on Earth, and would receive the Sacrament in the same gesture they did receive it from their Master, and not Kneel, they must be denied it by the Church of England on pain of Suspension, P. 14. and he takes it unkindly to be twitted with Ignorance in this Case, when he had confessed it, and in earnest he would have thanked me for it, if I would have helped him to answer it, P. 13.

Verily I thought that the Man that pretended to know, what I have reason to believe God himself will not pretend to, viz. That I writ the Surey Impostor out of Pride and Passion, with much Spleen and Rage, &c. could not be ignorant of any thing; and therefore I might well neglect to inform him, of what every common Christian I fancy knows; which is, that the Apostles were Universal Bishops; and as such, were to make Canons and Orders for the Churches to obey, as St. Paul did at Corinth; and not the Churches to make Orders for them. My Friend I suppose hath heard of a Fallacy call'd the *Begging of a Question*, such is this Argument of his, and so I dismiss it.

The Dissenters Third Argument you say is, that the imposing and tying of Men to a particular Form of Worship (without Authority from God) from which none shall vary, is an Invasion of God's Prerogative, &c. P. 14. Pray what makes you insert these words, *Without Authority from God*, I do not remember that they were in your first Letter, and I do suppose you foisted them in to confront the Government, and let the King and Parliament know that their Authority is not from God; for if it be, your Argument falls, since the Establishment of our Liturgy is upon their Authority; and if it be not, pray say whether it be Mr. Pope, or Jack Presbyter that holds from God. Youfly, my Friend, in the face of Authority, and would seditiously insinuate unto your Factious Party, that the King and Parliament in Establishing the Liturgy, which enjoys these Ceremonies, have acted *without Authority*
from

from God; and so to thy Tent, O Israel, may be your next Outcry.

Your next Argument of *Men's making Laws for God to obey*, P. 14, 15, shews you have as little Sense, as Wit; for a Man of Sense would never repeat such stuff as this is. As if God could not refuse them, if he did not approve of them; but he must needs *obey them*, and that upon a *Panalty* too. I am ashamed to hear a Man talk such Nonsense, especially one that pretends to be my Friend.

As for your Flourish upon this Nonsensical Argument of *Men's making Laws for God to Obey*, whereby you endeavour to make your Party Believe, that God was not to have his Worship in *Baptism*, unless the Child be signed with the Cross, &c. P. 15. 'Tis notoriously False, and another of your wicked Scandals, for when Circumstances require it, we insist not on those Ceremonies. But suppose you had for once spoken Truth, how easily might this Argument be retorted? If God must not have his Worship in the Lord's-Supper, unless you may sit upon your——not his Worship in Prayer, unless it may be with Extemporary Hums and Maws: If his Word must not be Preached, unless the Preacher may have the liberty to Cunt, and Whine; and the Hearers to keep their Hats dangling on their Round-Heads, for fear one of their Ears should catch cold, &c. Then they that so please, may think this an *Imposing upon God*, and making Laws for him to Obey, as my Friend wisely argues. Now such an Argument as this that will prove any thing, we alway used to say will prove nothing: Only it becomes you, my Friend, to consider once more, how you expose Religion, whilst, like one of Solomon's Mad-men, you sling Fire-brands and Arrows at the Church of England, which stands enriched with the Blood of her Martyrs, highly to be valued after that of Christ and his Apostles, whose Ashes you cannot suffer to take rest, but bespatter them with your dirt: For seeming to speak in favour of a Composed Form of Prayer, *that would raise the Affections of Hope, and Confidence in God*, P. 16. You have these words, but if they (*viz.* the Composers) should so be in Love with their own Prayer, as to tie all others to their very words, and none other——I should say they are proud, and conceited, and assume an Authority that does not belong to them, P. 16. If my Friend speak pertinently to the Point in hand, *viz.* a Publick form of Worship, he gives very good Language to those Holy Martyrs, that shed their Blood in the Reformation of our Church. The Papists cannot but thank you for this, and pray consider whose Tool you are, when you affirm those Glorious Reformers, not only to be Proud and Conceited, but to assume an Authority that did not belong to them. We bless God, our Reformation was not tumultuous,

tuous, but by a Legal Authority; and now the Reader may judge if this my Friend be not a fit Advocate to vindicate his Dissenters from being Tools of Popery, when he himself is so great a Minion of it.

My Friend's next concern is, that I should charge some Folk with *Foaming out their own shame*, in some Extemporary Prayers, which generally pass with them for a Praying by the Spirit, and he saith, *he never heard any such*, P. 16. The happier Man he, if we may believe him; for if he never heard, I am sure he might have read of such, both from Mr. Y. and Mr. C. in Page the 19th of my Answer; whence I infer, that the Man that can make himself Blind, can make himself Deaf also.

The Dissenter's 4th Argument, saith my Friend, was this, *Some of them think it. What, Friend, still upon other Mens thinking; and why some of them only, or who are they? Are they the Dons, or the Diminutive Slaves; the Baxters, or the Jack-Puddings of the Party? But be they who they will, they think it no less than Sacrilege, to transfer the Ends of God's Sacraments to their own Appointments*, P. 16. I know none that doth so with us; and I before have said that Sacraments and Ceremonies have different Ends; and so I might dismiss this Head, only I find the Cross to be again a Stumbling-block to my Friend, as it always was to Temporizing Christians. And what is the matter with it? Why Dissenters are offended that the same Honour should be put upon an *areal, transient Sign of the Cross, of Mens Institution, that belongs to Baptism, a Sacrament of God's Institution*, P. 17. And if this was true, they had good reason to be offended, but the Comfort is, it is another wicked Scandal of my Friend's Invention. I challenge him to produce one Author of the Church of England that ever asserted this; if he can. If he cannot, he ought to ask God and the Church pardon for such Villany; but my Friend, I suppose, is above Repentance.

But let us examine this Man's Notion of Baptism, which he makes only a Dedication of the Child to Christ; for speaking of the Sign of the Cross, he saith, *the Child is Dedicated already by Baptism, and therefore needs not, should not be Dedicated by the Cross*, P. 17. and again, *The Child is Dedicated by the Cross, who was before Dedicated by Baptism*, lb. Now tho' this be to evade what he saw he could not Answer, only Prefacing the last Passage with a *This is Fine indeed*, lb. which he meant to make the Dissenting Reader believe was an Answer: Let him speak out, is Baptism only a Dedication of a Child to Christ? I always took it to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, which I never read that the Sign of the Cross was so much as pretended to be. I thought Baptism had Incorporated me into Christ's Body, which

I never

I never heard the Sign of the Cross did. Well, the Child is Dedicated to Christ in Baptism; but what if he should not accept of this Dedication, for all People are not always pleased with what is Dedicated to them. I believe the *Surey* Ministers will not thank me for Dedicated my *Impostor* to them; why the poor Infant is to be lost for ever; and hence we may understand why these People quarrel with the Rubrick at the end of the Office of Publick Baptism; *It is certain by God's word that Children that are Baptized, dying before they commit Actual Sin, are undoubtedly Saved.* They look upon Baptism, if we rely on my Friend, as a Dedication which may be rejected, rather than a Covenant which must be performed.

He tells us farther, that *Dissenters say, That Infants are Baptized, in token hereafter they shall not be ashamed, &c.* and so should not the Cross be for the same thing. Ib. I perceive then they think that Baptism hath no present Efficacy, but it is according to him with them, like a Thread wrapt about the Little Finger, in token that hereafter you are to do so, and so.

Friend, in this same Page you confess the Church of England acknowledgeth Baptism to be perfect without the Sign of the Cross. Doth she so? then from your own Pen I perceive she doth not (as you elsewhere wickedly scandalize her) transfer the end of Sacraments to her own appointment. This you seem sensible of, and to shuffle off the Guilt, you ask a Question, and give the Answer, *P. 17.* Now tho' this would have made another Man a Fool, yet my Friend is *Sapientum Octavus*, and for ought I know, as wise as any of the Seven Wise Men of G. — But pray let me answer for my self. Your Question is, *What Crossing is good for?* The Church tells you, it is not only good, but proper to be a Token that we are not ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ Crucified, &c. But that is not all, I will tell you what it's farther good for. 'Tis good to shew our Unity with the Ancient Primitive Church, who used that Sign forty and forty times for our once. 'Tis good to shew that our Reformers, and we value the Peace of the Church above a few indifferent Ceremonies, and therefore at our Reformation retain'd what we innocently could, and receded no further from the Church of Rome, than she had receded from her self, and the Primitive Church. It is good for a great many things more, but there is one thing that it is extraordinary good for; and that is, to distinguish the Members of the Church of England from the Conventicles of Innovating Schismatics: To which I Subscribe *Probatum est.*

His last Eye-sore is poor Tobie's Blindness, which he takes ill that we make a Lesson of; and he, according to his Fanatical Honesty, insinuates, that we would be willing to have it thought Canonical,

Canonical, tho' all the World knows we account it Apocryphal : His Words are, *That it is either the pure word of God, as if we Dub'd it Canonical; in which words I suppose he would have rested, had not his Conscience struck him; and therefore he adds, or, that which is agreeable to the same, P. 17. Now suppose I should ask him wherein it disagrees; why, it tells you, that the Angel Raphael was the Son of Ananias the Great. An Angel Begotten by a Man! and call it a Lesson, Ib. I told my Friend I remember, he was as Blind as Tobit, and I believe it will appear so. For that Book being Parabolical (and I hope he will not Condemn Parables, lest he fly once more in the face of his Saviour) by transferring Appellatives into proper Names, the Angel is made to say, *that he is Azarias, the Son of Ananias*: Now Azarias signifies the Help of God, *אֶזְרִיאֵל*, and Ananias signifies the Grace of God, *אֲנָנִיָּא*. intimating that the help we have from God, is the Product and Issue of the Mercy of God, and so Azarias is the Son of Ananias. My Friend is a great Scholar, but a little afflicted, as I said, with Tobit's Infirmary; or else by the Angel's Reply to Tobit's Question, *Of what Tribe and Family he was, Ch. 5. v. 10. he might have seen he was of no Tribe, nor Family amongst them; for, saith he, v. 11. Dost thou seek for a Tribe or a Family, or an hired Man to go with thy Son?* and then describing his Office under the Signification of Proper Names, he saith, *he is Azarias, the Son of Ananias the Great, v. 12. i. e. an Helper sent to him from God, thro' the great Mercy of his God.* And now let my Friend cry out, *an Angel Begotten by a Man! and call it a Lesson.**

But 'tis time to close this Chapter of Ignorance, lest my Friend's Reputation should suffer too much by it.

CH A P. V.

Of the Charge of Knavery.

AS for the Knavery that he had made me to Charge them with, *he confesseth he dropt the Proof of it, but pretends it was because he found no particular Instances of it, P. 18. It is well if he himself be not found guilty of what I Charged them with; for I had proved Mr. J. and Mr. C. forging Certificates, and false Stories, which with us pass for Knavery, and 'tis strange he should not find them; yea he did find them, but could not answer them; but thought me very unjust (because I laid open the plain Truth) and therefore he dropt it, Ib. and is not this a singular way of Vindicating Dissenters from Knavery?*

He

He then takes notice of my Charging on the whole Party the Miscarriages of a few; and I joyn'd issue with him on this Head, and proved from the Approbation of the Leading Men of the Party, and the Applause which the Legend of the *Surey Demoniac* obtain'd amongst them, that it might justly be esteem'd an Act of the whole Party; and so much the more, in that they did not publicly Censure it. And all that he hath to say to this is, *As if every Idle Book and Story publish'd by Men of the Church of England, and not Censured by an Overt-Act, did involve them in the same guilt with the Editors*, P. 19. I suppose he means the Authors, and I am apt to believe it would; for if Seventeen of our Divines, and Fifty of our Laity, should publish a Book, and that be approved by the two Arch-Bishops, and applauded by the Clergy, let it be as silly and idle as it would, my Friend would not stick to Charge us all with the folly of it; and their Case being parallel in all things to this, they are like to bear their share in the Charge.

This Chapter treating of Knavery, I had expos'd that of my Friend about the word *Obsession*, which he would needs have to be a Church of England word, because it is met with in the 72 Canon, where such Practices as those of the *Surey* Ministers are Censured; and what hath he in Answer, why, *he confesseth he is Bewildred*, P. 20. and let me say it, without Vanity, I believe who ever reads what I writ, and what he answers, will be of his own Mind.

I had Charged him with *endeavouring to make the World believe, that I was intimate to W. C's Intrigue, and he saith I Charge him unjustly*, P. 20. His words are these, *you know the place, and I believe, can tell the Circumstances of his Hypocritical Carriage, and false Pretences*, Ler. 1. P. 17. and again, P. 18. *Mr. T. I have heard you know of some of these Villainies*. Now he that knows of another Villainies, and can tell the Circumstances of his Hypocritical Carriage, must needs be thought intimate to the Intrigue. So that the matter is thus; my Friend had basely scandaliz'd me, and to make me a requital, he continues in his Crime, and represents me as doing him Injustice, in clearing my own Innocence. That is, all must be Rogues and Rascals that will not say, (tho' it be false) what Fanaticks say; but they, good Saints, are white in their own Eyes as Snow, when by the Inquiry of their Deeds, they must be black as *Ethiopians*.

For you continue your little Tricks, I had said, you would insinuate, as if *W. C.* had a Licence to another Cure, which you say, is my *Untruth*, P. 21. You confess you say he *was introduc'd* *th.* and that looks pretty well towards insinuating a Licence. But, Friend, was that all you said? Where is your Integrity? did you not

not add, that he was greatly applauded by his Party, 1st. Let. P. 17. and continued there some time, Ib. till he was sought for to accept a better Place, P. 18. and let any one that knows the Constitutions of the Church of England judge, if such Expressions as these seem not to *Infermate a Licence*, which is all that you find fault with. And for you, Friend, since you positively affirmed that W. C. was collated, when he was not, you may well by these words be thought to *insinuate a Licence, which he had not*.

You intimate as if I should say, it was *notoriously false*, that W. C. was introduced into N. Chappel, P. 21. but this is only another *Notorious Falsity of yours*, for I never said so; the words *Notoriously False*, relate to what you asserted of W. C. being Collated to M. which was *Notoriously False*.

But now you are got into the Vein of Romancing on one hand, and Scandalizing thereupon with the other; you go on, and tell me, *I take a Traveller's Liberty, i. e. I Lye*, in affirming, all that was done, was at the Importunity of the Presbyterian Party, Ib. For the Truth of this, I appeal to the Right Reverend my Lord Bishop, who I know will justify me in what I said; by which the World may judge who it is that takes the Traveller's Liberty.

I accused my Friend for making a silly Argument, which I told him was his, and not mine; and since he was mistaken, he promiseth not to insist upon it; but for all that, he endeavours what he can, to make it appear mine, P. 21.

Other things I excepted against, he saith, were *Errata's*, and I do not know but they were, and as such shall esteem them, for I find I have need of the same Plea.

I took notice, that in his sling at the largeness of our Diocesses, where Bishops were to see with other Men's Eyes, and hear with other Men's Ears, he reflected upon Christ, who Delegated his Apostles to far larger Provinces than any we have; and where they were obliged to hear with other Mens Ears, 1 Cor. 5. 1. as well as our Bishops are. He gives no Answer at all to this, nor can he, but he would make the World believe, that I meant to justify the *Largeness, of our Diocesses, by the Example of Christ, and his Apostles*, P. 22. which is notoriously false again. Had I meant that, I should have used other Arguments; all that I intended was, to let him see that the Dirt he flung at our Bishops, flew in the face of the Blessed Jesus, and there he suffers it to stick.

I find my Friend, vex'd that we are capable of justifying our selves in those Prayers to God, wherein we entreated him, *That he would keep, and strengthen King James in the true Worshipping of him*——For I told him what is plain to every one, That it was
the

the True Worship of God (some part of which in the Communion he was of was retain'd) that we pray'd he might be kept in, and not those parts of it which are *Superstitious and Idolatrous*. And what Replies he to this? Why, you would think he was playing at *Cross Questions*. He talks of Discourfing of the Idolatrous Worship of the Papists, and according to the Honesty of his Talent, makes Scurrilous Reflections on our Church; observing *how Tenderly we deal with the Papists: Their Worship* (he makes us to say) *is True: Whereas that of Dissenters is Erroneously Religious*, P. 23. Goodman Friend, or it may be *Worshipful, or Right Worshipful, as you tell me*, P. 26. is this Misrepresentation, or no? Where is the Man that ever said that Popish Worship, as Popish, was true. If you wear a Christian Conscience, I think it will scarce suffer you to take any Rest, till you have Recanted, and Repented of this Scandal.

You have been told, you say, That Idolatrous Worship mixed with something of True Worship doth defile the whole, P. 23. You have been told of a great many things, I find, that are not true: The Jews we read worshipp'd *Baal*, and many other Idols, as well as the God of Heaven; and was his true Worship defiled by their Idolatry? let my Friend say it, if he dare. Suppose Friend, you had been a Priest in the days of Solomon, and had pray'd God to have kept and strengthen'd him in the *True Worshipping of him*, as we pray'd for K. James, I believe no Prophet would have Rebuk'd my Friend for it, as he doth the *Lancashire-Levite*. For any one that pleaseth, may see the Adjective that is joyn'd to Worshipping, (*viz.*) True; to be Disjunctive of all Worship that is Untrue, or Idolatrous. Pray let us Gloss the Words according to my Friend's Interpretation, and we shall see, what an Excellent Commentator he is; *That it may please thee to keep, and strengthen in the True* (that is according to my Friend's sense, *the Idolatrous*) *Worshipping of thee*. Take it you for a Grammarian.

But he is much concern'd that I should say, that *Prayer was a Means, and the Best means to Reclaim K. J. from his Errors*, p. 24. Now to dull am I, that I alway thought Prayers a Means, and one of the Best Means too, to reclaim any one from the Error, as well as the Evil of his Ways. And what makes my Friend in such Indignation at Prayer; in his first Letter he gave a Bill of Divorce to *Fasting*; and now he is not pleas'd with *Prayer*, and a sweet Religion of his own, he will make shortly. But perhaps it is not Prayer in General, but the Form of Prayer that doth disgust him; for possibly he would have been pleas'd well enough, if we had pray'd for K. James, as one of his good Friends is said to have prayed in a Neighbouring Church in former Days for Prince Ru-

part. Bore him good Lord, Bore him, not with an Anger, nor with an Aul; but with an Aul-Gimblet, that he Tent may follow.

It seems you have found out one Honest Priest of the Church of England that mended the matter; for he changed the words into such as these, *That God would Direct, and bring him into, and keep*—P. 24. One Question, Friend, Was not the Foundation of K. James's Religion Christian? If it was (tho' the Superstructure should be Hay, &c.) to what other True Religion would you, and your honest Priest have God to have directed and brought him? would you have him turn Turk, whom you are pleas'd to Vindicate, as you do the Dissenters; so free are you of your Vindication. In my Judgment, your Priest had better have kept to the settled Form, for the True Worship, that we pray'd God to keep him in, as I have said, was Exclusive of what was Idolatrous.

But you say, we may thus Pray for the Turk: And if any should say, He doth not Worship God truly, *Yes, may it be answer'd, he owns the True God*, P. 24.

My Friend hath an excellent hand at Vindications; he began with Vindicating the *Surey* Ministers, he then undertook for *Cobrah, Dathan, and Abiram*, and now he Avouches for the Turk. He owns the True God, tho' he Worship him not Truly, and therefore you may pray to God, to keep him in his False Worship of him: for the C. of E. Men pray'd God to keep K. J. in the True Worship of him. But hark you, Friend, If there be an Argument in your words, 'tis this, *He that owns the True God, Worship him also truly*, for therein lies your Vindication of the Turk: For if any should say, *The Turk doth not Worship God truly*; *Yes, say you, may it be answer'd, He owns the True God*. And had the *Athenians* known this Argument, when St. Paul accused them for Worshipping the true God *Ignorantly, and Superstitiously*, I cannot but think how they would have maul'd the Apostle. Well, Friend, stick to your Tackle, for now that you have got *Mahomet* for your Second, you two may deal well enough with the *Lancashire Levite*.

The last thing Observable, he saith, is, *the Justifying my self for my words, and hard Speeches from the Examples and Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles*, P. 25. Now so Blockish was I, that I knew not how to justify my Conduct better, than by the Doctrine, and Example of Christ, and his Apostles: But my Friend being a Wise Man, knows I suppose some better Method, and he would do well, to let the World also know it. The Apostle calls upon us to be Followers of him, as he was of Christ; but my Friend will not suffer me to follow these Examples; I suppose

suppose he would have me follow *Corah*, and *Mahomet*, and such others as he Vindicates; for if I follow Christ and his Apostles, *some of his Tender-boos'd Men will startle and boggle at it, P. 25.* Let them Boggle as long as they will, I am not afraid of Hobgoblins. But, pray, Friend, what makes you cry out, *What, compare your self with Christ, and his Apostles, Ib.* Where was it I did so? Or is not this another of your wicked Slanders; cannot I follow Christ's Doctrine and Example, but I must Compare my self with him? But I find where I pinch you, you are unwilling to be told of your Sins, and for ought I see, will suffer no one to Reprove you, *unless he know Mens hearts, as Christ did, Ib.* and when I am attain'd to that, *I shall have your consent to call Men Hypocrites, &c. Ib.* Now why I may not call them so, as well as you, I know not; and yet I Challenge you to name (if you can) the Person that I call so. As for you (tho' I think you know not Mens hearts, yet) you Charge *W. C's Carriage to be Hypocritical, Let. 1. p. 17, and repeat it again, Let. 2. p. 20. You call Mr. G. a Religious Hypocrite, Let. 1. p. 18.* Not to mention the Pride, and Spleen, that you pretend to know is lodged in my heart, of all which, I shall only remind you of what you say your self, *Whogave thee Authority to Judge Mens Hearts, P. 26.* You wind up your bottom with these words: *If you have a mind, to assume the Authority of Christ to call Men Satan, (for it seems you'll allow Peter to have a Devil, tho' Dugdale none) it may possibly be as good a Warrant for others to call you a Devil; i.e. a False Accuser or Slanderer, P. 25.* Pray, Friend, did I ever call any Man Satan? If I did, shew it. If I did not, what are you? Again, where is it that I allow'd *Peter* to have a Devil? for I cannot find it; or who guided your hand when you wrote this? If Lying be of its Father the Devil, you may call me as you do, *a Devil* if you please, for I shall be no worse, nor you much better for it.

CHAP. VI.

Being his Answer to the POSTSCRIPT.

AS for the *Postscript*, whoever will compare it with the Ingenuity of Mr. Gr's Confession on one hand, and the Testimony that is given to his Christian Conversation on the other, will understand Friend, what you are, tho' he knows not who you are; and that you make it your Trade to Rob Men of their

Reputation; and possibly for that End, Conceal your Name: which if it was known, might be so Notoriously Infamous, that neither your Tongue nor Pen would be capable of Creating a Slander. If therefore any suffer by Men's Conjectures at the Author, as you pretend, P. 26. you are the Cause of it, who either will not, or dare not say who you are. Let therefore the Right Worshipful Knight, the Worshipful M. D. and the Bookish Countrey Gentleman, with all the rest of the Candidates, lay their hands on their Hearts, and thank my Friend for his kindness to them, who by Insinuating them to be the Authors, Entitles them to all the Guilt that his Wicked and multiplied Slanders, his Foul Misrepresentations, and his Atheistical Expressions appropriate to himself; an Abstract of which he may meet with in the following Chapter.

CHAP. VII.

REMARKS on my Friend's Integrity.

IF a Man have a Bad Cause to Plead, there is no Advocate so proper, as one that hath neither Honesty, nor Piety; for he not Fearing God, will not much Regard how he abuseth Man. And such a Patron the Dissenters seem to have got to manage the Case of the *Surrey-Demoniack*. For though he finds his Case nought, and is forced to confess it a Cheat, Letter 1st, P. 3. 22. Yet he raiseth an Outcry of Popery, Superstition, &c. that he may blind his Reader, whilst he changeth his Ground. Now though this is not material to the Question (*viz.*) Whether there was a Demoniac at the *Surrey* or no? (Unless my Friend by it, meant to prove that the Devil was in the throng of them there, as he was in *Ananias*, Let. 2. P. 5.) yet that the weaker sort might not be deceived by this Pretence, I was forced to follow him there; and how doth he acquit his Friends from the Charge he had laid against them? Why the Truth is, He acknowledgeth them *GUILTY*, either by a Tacit, or open Confession.

I said, The Book Entituled, *The Surrey Demoniac look'd toward Popery*, and he doth not deny it: But would wickedly Insinuate to the Reader, that I positively had said, *It was Popery*, Let. 2. P. 1. Answ. 2. P. 5. I said, *the Dissenting Ministers were in the Surrey Business Tools of Popery*; and he doth not deny it. Answ. 2. P. 6.

I Charged

I Charged them as he saith with Superstition, and proved it on them from his own Papers; and therefore he wisely saw, it was to no purpose to deny it, Answ. 2. P. 15.

I Charged them, as he saith, with Schism, or making Divisions; and he openly acknowledgeth, that in part he must confess it. Let. 2. p. 9. Answ. 2. p. 19, 20.

I Charged them, as he saith, with Ignorance; and his words are, You say True in that, Let. 2. P. 11. Though in the same Paragraph, in the space of two Lines, there are two Untruths, that he falsely fixeth upon me, Answ. 2. p. 29.

*I Charged them, as he saith, with Knavery, and that of such a Nature, that in another Case, it might have cost them their Ears; and he confesseth he dropt it, Let. 2. p. 18. But then according to his wonted Sincerity, he hath the Impudence to say, He found no particular Instances, *Id.* when in the Impostor there was the Certificate in self that they had forged, Imp. p. 7, 8.*

These Crimes I did not formally lay to their Charge, but as I pass'd along with the *Surey Impostor*, gave hints at them. But the Vindicator in my Name, formally drew them up into an Indictment against them, and how he hath acquitted them from them, the World sees.

There were other things I directly Charged them with, I will but instance one; (*viz.*) *Pluralities*, of which, *Forty Two Ministers in Lancashire* have more than all the *Church-Men* in England have. And my Friend said, if this was so, He would never Excuse them from Ambition, Pride, and Covetousness, nor from being Self-Condemned, Let. 1. p. 20. and when I had proved it upon them, he drops it in his Second Letter, and leaves them burthen'd with all the Guilt that he himself hath loaded them with.

Thus you see how Unable my Friend is to Vindicate his Clients, yet Scribble for them he will; and there are two Vertues of his, Dishonesty, and Impiety, of which his Letters chiefly consist.

First, His Dishonesty will be manifested, from that Insincerity, those Reservations, Scandals, Untruths, and I think I may add, if not Forgery, Fictions that appear in his Letters.

L. His

His Insincerity begins with his very Preface, where he would make the Reader believe, that *I made Reflections on Hilderheim, &c.* when I only made a Quotation, *Answ.* 2. p. 3.

I Charged the Dissenters with *Ignorance, or Neglect*, he leaves out *Neglect*, and pretends the Charge wholly to be *Ignorance*, *Let.* 2. p. 11, 12. *Answ.* p. 29. Many Instances I might give, but I will mention but one more.

The Exception he took at the Largeness of our Diocesses, with his Reasons for it, I told him *flow in the face of Christ, who Delegated his Apostles to Larger Provinces than our Diocesses are*. Hence he would pretend that I meant to justify the Largeness of our Diocesses by the Example of Christ, and his Apostles, *Let.* 2. p. 22, 23. *Answ.* 2. p. 51, 52.

II. His Reservations are these, He endeavours to conceal *Corah's* Schism from the Eye of the Common Reader, by affirming that if he Subscribed the Articles of the Jewish Faith, in *That*, he was no Schismatick, *Let.* 2. p. 19. *Answ.* 2. p. 22.

He would insinuate, that the *Turk* worships God truly, because he worships the True God, *Let.* 2. p. 24. *Answ.* 2. p. 54, 55.

III. His Scandalous Slanders are many; he would intimate that they are more Guilty that Adore God before the Altar, than they are that Adore the Sacrament of the Altar, *Let.* 2. p. 4. *Answ.* 2. p. 13.

He pretends that our Arguments which justify our separating from the Church of Rome, will justify the Dissenters Separation from us, *Let.* 2. p. 11. *Answ.* p. 27, 28.

He would make the Reader believe, that our Ceremonies are of the same Nature, Use, Significancy and End with God's Appointments, *Let.* 1 & 2. p. 12. *Answ.* 2. p. 31. &c.

He hints, as if our Government was not from God, *Let.* 1. p. 11. *Let.* 2. p. 14. *Answ.* 2. p. 39, 40.

He represents Our Reforming Martyrs that Composed our Liturgy, as Proud and Conceited Men, *Let.* 2. p. 16. *Answ.* 2. p. 41, 42.

IV. His Untruths abound (I pass by what relates to my self) As when he saith, to his Interpretation of *Δαριδαιονία*, signifying of Demons, I insert the word Wholly, *Let.* 2. p. 7. *Answ.* 2. p. 18, 17, that I call'd somebody Satan, and said Peter had a Devil, *Let.* 2. p. 25. *Answ.* p. 56, 57.

He

He is confessedly Guilty, in affirming *W. C.* to be by the Bishop collated to *M. Let. 2. p. 20.* And more spitefully Guilty, when he insinuates, *as if God must not have his Worship in Baptism, unless the Minister do Sign the Child with the Sign of the Cross, &c. Let. 2. p. 15. Answ. 2. p. 40, 41.*

V. His Fictions (if I may not call them Forgeries) consist, in framing for me Arguments, that I never used, and then assigning pitiful Reasons, why he thought them mine, *Let. 2. p. 4. & 21. Answ. 2. p. 14, & 51.*

2. His Impiety consists in such Atheistical Expressions, as too openly expose Christ; and Religion, such are these:

He not distinguishing betwixt the Senses, in which Humane and Sacred Writers, use *Δαίμονιον*, which is applied in the best Sense to Christ, *Acts 17. 18.* thus wittily enough, but as Atheistically plays upon the word. *What Paul! Would you not have Men to Worship Demons? why Christ is a Demon: Let. 2. p. 7.* So again, *What Wretches! offer to cast a Demon out of Dicky? Why Christ is a Demon, &c. Ib.*

He Prophanely calls the Alternation of Worship, such as the Angels perform in Heaven, *A Bouncing, and Racking of David's Psalms, Let. 1. p. 11. Let. 2. p. 6.*

He Irreligiously termeth the Posture in which the Apostle's received at their Master's hands the Sacrament of his Last Supper, *a Lolling, Let. 2. p. 14.*

These are the Perfections of the Dissenter's Vindicator, and such a Libeller as this, may, if he please, Scribble on, but must expect no other Answer than that of *Contempt.*